

20211121

Thanks for downloading a 3cr podcast. 3cr is an independent community radio station based in Melbourne, Australia. We need your financial support to keep going. Go to [www.3cr.org.au](http://www.3cr.org.au) for more information and to donate online. Now stay tuned for your 3 CR podcast.

Panoply panorama panpipe pansy aha pansexual knowing no boundaries of sex or gender sound interesting. Then join Sally on Sundays at noon for out of the pan. All those gender questions making you think too hard? Whether it's transgender bisexual polyamorous or Beyond will throw those questions into the pan and cook up the answers for you. So go on push that gender envelope. Only on 3 CR 855 am digital and 3cr Dot org dot a u

3 CR 855 am 3cr Digital [3cr.org.au](http://3cr.org.au) and 3cr On Demand Out of the Pan with Sally first broadcasting noon through one Australian eastern daylight savings time. And well, I think we can say today and I'll tell you why. In a second nine through 10 Australian Western Standard Time 3 CR broadcasts from the lands of the Wurndjeri people of the Kulin nation, and we pay respect to Elder's past present and hello to any Aboriginal and Torres Strait. Islander people tuning in from whichever land or lands you may be on and we acknowledge of course that all the lands on this continent and surrounding Islands were stolen and never seeded. I'm Sally Goldner, I use the pronouns she/her, I'm your host for out of the pan a show covering pansexual issues knowing no boundaries of sex or gender and well a lot to cover today and I will raise content warnings if we get to, probably will get to other topics in the second half of the show, but there will be talk of violence. And well the issue of sexual harassment. The content warning for now is they'll be mentions of could be mentioned of I'll say lgbtiqa+ phobia, so please contact Q life including switchboard in Victoria and Tasmania on 1 800 184527, or you can contact the rainbow door 1800 72 9 3 6 7 or SMS the rainbow door, 0480017246.

To get in touch with the show. Lots of ways to do it, email out of the pan 855 at [gmail.com](mailto:outofthepan@gmail.com) SMS six one four, five, six, seven, five, one, two, and five tweet at [sell gold set](https://twitter.com/sellgoldset). So and that's the bottom line and look for posts on Facebook on my page, Sally golden the am and out of the pan 3cr 855 am Melbourne. Remember any opinions expressed on the show on my own and not those of any organization with which I'm

involved past or present, which leads to a disclosure for my guests today, who introduced in a second. I have been doing some volunteering work at committee level with the committee of just equal and mention all of that because we opened we opened with God told me to from Paul Kelly stolen Apples because the latest draft of the federal, well, I'll use the name. It's given religious discrimination, bill was released during the week.

And well there we need to talk about it. I think would be one way to put it. One person who's on the line from the West to do that and thank you for your time. So it's such an early hour is spokesperson for just equal Brian Gregg, Brian. Thanks for coming on out of the pan.

Thank you, Sally, and good afternoon, two. Three Co this this. Yep, good afternoon over here. Well, in part of the part of the he's getting there in South Australia and Queensland. And so on and Brian, you're a spokesperson for just equal and your well, in part of the western part of this large island and you were just, I forgot to check this off here, but what? Hopefully know which land your on your lands.

I recently moved from Perth City to the Southwest. So your listeners would probably recognize it as the Margaret River Region, which is the land of the were ND people. So it's a subset of the nomadic peoples who lived through the southwest of wa and I'll even wear Randy country. Thanks for clarifying. That and it's very important that we acknowledge. All the lands. We are on and keep working to reconciliation, which will have a practical part of the conversation. We

Have. Because during the week, the federal coalition government, released its latest version of. Well, I'm trying to be as neutral as I can also a religious discrimination bill, but now there are concerns about it. And what we want to talk about today to give an overview, our or brief history of what, where we've got to to this point. Starting safe from four years ago after the achievement of marriage equality, then you know where there's been things wrong in.

Previous drafts. What is will say, good neutral and bad about the current version and if we do have concerns, what can we do to address them? So let's perhaps this. Do the

helicopter view first starting, of course, from about 4 years ago. Let's just put that back on the record.

Well, I guess the first thing to say Shelly is we don't we don't get in a literal sense. We don't know what's in the current iteration really know what we're hearing from reported sources, but those reported sources are close to the government. And I'm referring specifically here to commentators at the Australian. The Australian newspaper is clearly. The country's most conservative newspaper. It's the most Pro coalition government media salt.

That's it. Also reflects a lot of the views and values of the religious. Right. And it's clear from their commentary over the last few days that there is a third iteration of this bill at yet another redraft and that the government intends to formally bring it into the parliament very soon. Probably within the next week. And in loose terms, we understand from this reportage and for commentary, subsequently from attorney general mukasey Akash that it has been watered down, quote-unquote, and I urge.

Caution with embracing that term too quickly because certainly there it would appear there have been changes which less than its impact from earlier. But that's from the perception of those people who have very right-wing views on. So they will the religious conservatives, the fundamentalist the evangelicals won't be happy with some of the changes that have been made but that doesn't make it a better bill or indeed a good one. So what we Loosely understand, is that the so-called

Old Fallout cause has been watered down. So your listeners may know that one of the key pushes for this bill was frustration from the religious conservatives over the question of Israel. Folau. Who, let's shorten a long story short, but did he basically was was kicked out of rugby Australia because he breached his contract. That's the fact of it, but religious conservatives spin a different argument on that and they say no, no, he was kicked out of his job because he has

Suppress, his religious views privately, and was punished by his employer for that. And that's the sticking point for religious conservatives. So, part of the push from the Australian Christian Lobby had me and their supporters was to have a religious freedom bill. So that people like Fallout would have the freedom to say whatever. They like about

lgbt people and simply get away with it. Well, that Clause was in the original. The iteration 1 & 2.

This bill, but it is no longer day. Or at least we understand it has been watered down, largely Under Pressure. I understand from the business Community because they were concerned about how this might impact on, on large businesses. Remembering, this particular Clause would only impact businesses with turn over 50 million or more. So, we're talking about very large organizations were talking about your answers and you Qantas is of those sorts of things, but those businesses have an extraordinary large number of

Lgbt PT and many of them over and many of them over recent years, have gone to Great Lengths, to ensure equity and diversity programs to, you know, to and some of them like Qantas for example, got actively involved in the marriage equality campaign. So they're very concerned about how much of that could be undone by having this Fallout Clause. This loophole in their workplace and a lot of workplaces understandably were very anxious.

It's about it. So we understand that is now been considerably watered down that the technicality of which, I'm not sure because I haven't seen you, but we're hearing, we're hearing that the full impact of that proposal is no longer there. The other thing which we understand has been removed completely and this is a tremendously good thing. Is that the denial of services has been ripped out. So the original Bill proposed that particularly in health services or Health Services, especially

Lee. So we're talking about pharmacists, chemists, doctors counselors, aged care workers, that kind of thing. That they would have the right to refuse services to people, effectively that they disapproved of. So if you had a fundamentalist a Roman Catholic doctor or up Hardline, you know, Vatican doctor or a fundamentalist chemist or simply a nursed in a, in an aged care home.

He had strong views against lgbt people, then they on the basis of their personal religious belief. They could deny services to people in our community horrific stuff going far beyond what? I imagined what is permissible in the US, for example, or at least it's of

that kind of crazy stuff that came out of the, the Mike Pence bill, in Indiana, not wanting to confuse.

Things too much. But yeah, making the point here that the so-called Religious Freedom Movement began with the evangelicals in the US it started as a backlash to marriage equality and it became a culture War around those two things, which the Morrison government seems Keen to now want to import into Australia. Yeah, sometimes I just I just want to throw in some examples of what could have happened under that realm, you know, sort of Health provider type of clause trans person goes in with a script for hormones to the Farms is there?

Like you sorry, not serving you. And if you're on the only Pharmacy, in a Country Town, what happens, then well, true story because Katherine Barrett's Research into aged care many years ago. My people talked about well trans people having their hormones taken off them by age care workers. And we'll couples will say in inverted commas other than male or female being separated. Even though they were in a relationship, many, many other things, and also bringing in that this affects broader than lgbtiq a plus, we're talking women as

And when women and abortion, all those who can carry children, I should beg my bone, pardon there and abortions, and things like that. So a lot of things. So, that is, at least we'll say a step back from the abyss so to speak, but we're still only a few metres away from their best. So just come on. Let's go through more of what has been as you say alleged to be in this bill that may be released this week.

Yes, so that brings us back to what we what we know or we can reasonably assume is maintained for me that comes down to two key areas of particular concern. The first is the bill, it is clear will override a large section of tasmania's anti-discrimination, enacted, section 17. And people might say, well, this is, this is odd. Why I only Tasmania and wear braces. A good question, isn't it? Isn't it? Extraordinary?

That the government would bring in the build that specifically targets knocking over anti-discrimination act in one state alone. What's going on there? And the reality is, this is part of the culture War, it goes back to a complaint that was lodged under tasmania's

anti-discrimination. Act against statements, authorized by Catholic Archbishop of Hobart. Mr. Julien porteous who during the marriage campaign,

Authorized a document that was distributed throughout Tasmania the document purported to be a reflection of canon law or a fracture, a reflection of the Catholic position on marriage and, and much of it was. But some of it was very specifically anti-lgbt. I own quite nasty in particular, it made commentary around the notion that same-sex couples mess with children, quote-unquote. And of course that has echoes.

Of the language used against us when we are targeted as being paid a files. Yeah, and it was a very nasty and unnecessary comment to make in the context of Defending traditional marriage. I mean, it was unnecessary. That must be pointed out here that that very same document was distributed Nationwide. So every Catholic Diocese distributed that document. So why in Tasmania did it become an issue? The

Her is Tasmania has Australians best anti-bullying law rules. If you want to paraphrase, then they have an excellent more where some States, including your own. I believe have laws against incitement to hatred and vilification but tasmania's goes further. Tasmania's has has laws against humiliating, intimidating, or insulting people. Now, that's not as Loose as you might think because these things are very finely tuned in terms of

Definitions. And you cannot abuse that system. You cannot rush off to the age of discrimination Clause, clutching your pearls, and saying, I've been insulted, it doesn't work like that. But if you believe that something harmful has been done. Then there is a, there is a facility for that and that happened over the porteous case and of course, that infuriated religious conservatives because, although they wouldn't say this, the reality is they hated their Authority.

He being questioned, they hated that. They were on a Level Playing Field with everybody else and were suddenly no longer Above the Law, unlike their colleagues on the mainland. Now that case ultimately didn't go ahead because the person who made the complaint withdrew it before it came to any final conclusion, but the process was interesting. It's often described as the Catholic Archbishop being hauled before the anti-discrimination board and having to

Justify the Catholics position on marriage. And of course, that's a complete lie. Archbishop party spots infect invited to a voluntary one hour conciliation hearing with the complainant. And the process was to talk through how he might get, might consider making changes to the language, he used, so that he could continue to express the Catholic position on marriage without demeaning same-sex couples in their families, but

Of course, the Archbishop refused to do that because ultimately I believe because he's his church and his supporters wanted the fight and that and that fight continues to this day and is reflected in the so-called religious discrimination bill, which is now in front of us.

The second and for me more concerning aspect of the bill and what we understand and and pausing, you know, teasing out that the language that we're seeing in the reports from the Australian newspaper is that it's clear that the Commonwealth, it seems clear that the Commonwealth wants to have a national framework. So that states and territories cannot prohibit.

Faith schools. And it's not clear if that extends to other Faith run Charities, and aged Care, Homes, and whatever, but certainly schools. So they cannot be prevented from discriminating against LGBTI children and children from same-sex families. So as you'd be aware some states and territories prohibit discrimination in faith, organizations, against LGBTI kids, particularly.

Schools. So you cannot discriminate against them at enrollment. You cannot expel them while they are a student and same applying to start teachers and had me stuff. You cannot, you cannot discriminate against them at whatsoever when they're applying for a job applicant, applying for a job or indeed, if they're already there. And, of course, around the country, there are hundreds of LGBTI people who are happily working away.

Within Faith schools, the religious conservatives don't like the fact that some states have done this and they're looking for a way, not only to overturn that, but to cement the Discrimination practice Nationwide, and it would appear, it would appear that. That is what this bill is trying trying in part to achieve. So I'm aware that in your state. Your

Premier. Dan Andrews has announced or perhaps introduced legislation to do this very thing, too.

Discrimination against LGBTI teachers in the state of Victoria. And it would seem that if this bill were to pass federally and be successful, that it would effectively extinguish that. Or, at least that's how understanding at this time and that's very concerning. Well, I absolutely there's a couple of things that come in here. I mean, under the national Constitution, if there's a clash between laws Federal override State, and even perhaps, even more a little more, so territory, but the other thing,

Ng is the ongoing issue that comes in here about statement of belief and I wanted to come back to that in context of what you said about the employer issue. Because to me there's another angle as well as employers not being able to support rainbow Pride type of situations and run networks or whatever else or do that effectively. I should say. But there's also the issue of two people are working for an employer person. A says, to person be your religion silly. I don't like it and then B says to I know your religion, silly. I don't like you.

Is how the heck does this work? Whose statement of belief would have precedent? So it seems very messy and I can totally understand the concerns of employers. It would just create a, you know, an Administration, Human Resources, people and culture nightmare. So there's all these sorts of issues that are wrong with what we are hearing about draft. Number three. I suppose. This dive got to a couple more critical questions. What do we want? I mean if the what we're hearing is

Accurate. What do we want from the point of view of LGBTQ+ and many other groups are affected. Women people with disabilities. I'm not sure if there are even more, but I'm probably will be what do we want? And how do we achieve it? So what do we want? I mean, we're talking about what we don't want, but let's talk about what we do want in. What would be a good bill? And then also, if there are differences, how would we go about? Remedying things to achieve?

The Better Built.



Yeah, well, I guess let's talk about the real politics first and that is numbers politics. Always comes down to numbers. So how do the Numbers Never this? And the reality is even from the government's perspective. This is very tight. We understand that, at this point in the top at this point in time. The government is still struggling, still working. Its way to get this bill through its own party room. That if our Parliament,

Because there are a handful of moderates and back benches within the Liberal Party who rightly share the concerns that many people in our community. Do you know, and there are a number of those in your own State including former human rights Commissioner Tim Wilson and our community had had an ally during the marriage equality. They diffuse going in one inch in Queensland and he too has

Real concerns about this. Now. We can't rely on those people. It's entirely, but it's good to know that. They're, they're putting these views forward. And I note with interest, the the silence so far. From Senator Dean Smith from Western Australian who was a very strong advocate for marriage equality and quite different from his own party. A few years ago, on this issue and help chef.

But that legislation through the Parliament and through his conservative Community. I just note with interest that he's been rather silent on this issue. And I wonder if perhaps he isn't going to say something in the next few days. I'm not hinting at anything. I'm just curious. So those people those people are there. What do we need? Of course? I must make the point to that. It's incredibly disappointing and just a little bit concerning that we've heard next to nothing from labor on this.

Now, am I know that they're the opposition and at the moment they're saying, well, you know, we haven't seen the bill and technically, that's true. They've not seen the bill but there's nothing to prevent them from expressing some core beliefs, and some values. You know, where do they stand on a national framework? That would extinguish existing anti-discrimination laws, including those that protect LGBT, our kids and teachers. Where do they stand on? The

The concept around the follow Fallout Claws. And so we never even heard anything from at all on the denial of services when that was on the card. So that is deeply concerning and we've heard nothing from the state premieres, including the labor

premise. It's interesting that just in the last few days the liberal premiere of Tasmania. Peter Gut one came out very strongly against the Campo this build and against the Commonwealth override of his Estates Lords. So we've heard

More in opposition to this proposed legislation from a liberal Premier. Then we have from any state. Grant that concerns me because it says to me that labor is anxious about how this bill will play in some of its key marginal seats and we're talking Western Sydney. Yeah. So New South Wales is the most conservative Electric in the country and there's a large pocket of seats in and around Western Sydney, which all voted no in the postal survey on marriage, equality.

And many of those seats are strongly supportive or they're sitting members are strongly supportive of passing, some kind of religious freedom bill. Because they believe that in some way their rights and freedoms are currently curtail in a way, which they are. In fact, not so labor is very anxious about this album. He's he's very anxious about this, and it means to this point in time. They've been very silent. So we're seeing, I think a replay, it's deja vu.

From 2004, when on the eve of on the eve of a federal election, the Howard government conservative government. Through this little hand grenade into the parliament in the dying days and the last few days of the sitting, before an election to ban marriage between same-sex couples, and it's split and shattered. The Labour party who didn't know how to deal with it. And Mark, Latham is leader with the support of his party, panic, and supported it, and it went through. And, of course, that then became an

Across around Labor's neck, for the next decade. And my concern is that exactly the same thing. Is it may happen here? Where the Coalition Mr. Morrison is next going to throw in this little hand grenade into the parliament in the very last few days of the sitting weeks before a federal election on, on a control issue, on a social issue, which is going to shatter and panic the Labour party. And I'm deeply concerned that they may either pass this or

Have a conscience vote on it, which would be equally bad because if flavor split on this and it was a conscious vote, then it would go through the parliament because there are enough people in both the liberal party and the Labour party on, on conscience, who

would support this. And that would be a very worrying precedent because it would also mean that for the first time ever the Labour party, which historically has only ever held conscience votes on the life-and-death issues. So we're talking abortion euthanasia.

Shh. Now, lump us into the same basket. So now, you know, the rights and freedoms of LGBTI people is now a life and death issue for perhaps for some men's department. So that's in the background. And that's concerning. What should we be doing as a community? Look, there's a number of things but I think the key one at the moment is to be lobbying our MPS. They really need to be hearing from us and because of the things I've just said, a moment ago. I'm not just talking about

Up and members, but Labour members to it's my belief particularly that in the senate in the upper house. It's quite possible that with the back benches with the greens and a couple of Center Alliance and if labor were to join with that. If it's possible that labor could block this legislation, if they voted as a group and didn't split on conscious they could block this bill in the Senate. So while the

L'm might come from the government. The solution could come from labor. I think, perhaps, what is more likely though? Is that the nervous MPS in both camps would rather this was kicked into the long grass. So I think what we may see over the next fortnight is that this bill is introduced. There's a bit of media fuss around me, and then some MPS kick it off to committee which puts it the other side of the election that

The main we're out of the woods, of course because if the government is returned, we all come back to this again. And if Mr. Albin Eassey is elected prime minister. He still going to have to deal with this, in some way to placate a section of the community and section of his own backbench. So educating around the facts of the bill is important, getting motivated behind our MPS and letting them know that we're watching.

Them. And that we, none of us. Want to see what is effectively a backlash from Marriage Equality. We're all rather tired of doing this. I think. Yeah, we're sick and tired of having to, on a weekly basis combat, the religious conservatives, who continue to attack the gains we've made and want to block any future progress. And we really need our support of MPS to stand up for us and say look, this is not on, this is Australia 2021 and this

Iced tea culture war from the US has no place here. Yep, lots of thoughts to come in there and we've had a few comments in from listeners Molina. Just wanted to add the doctors can't deny service under the Hippocratic Oath, Molina's, other comment from a few minutes ago, which telepathically was tapping into your thought processes. Molina was watching, insiders this morning and Patricia. Kavala, said that gay and pees like Trent Zimmerman will be lobbying hard and looking at the bill closely so we certainly need need that.

At one of our other listeners, it is said and I'll just as well as been somewhat critical of Tim Wilson says, I don't trust him and has more trust in Trent Zimmerman, but I suppose we've sort of got to get all the numbers we can. And the other part of it in the Senate is crossbenchers and you know, sort of trying to get to them as well. Although of course, if labor oppose it and enough people from the Coalition in both, how at least one house supposed, but preferably both we're sort of in a better position but uh,

I agree with your comments that whether this sort of his past prior to the election and I totally acknowledge what you said about 2004 agreed. So let's hope, labor learns. So we somehow need to get labor and some of these crossbenchers to be well more calm and less nervous. I suppose, which is one thing we can do or mentioning that Molina watched insiders this morning. Can we access media? Of course, any other thoughts on effective?

Tactics that will make sure that this bill is now hopefully in the end defeated and as quickly as possible or preferably delayed and or modified to not be as extreme.

I think so, perhaps the key thing to do and it's it's simple in its concept but perhaps harder in its execution and and that is simply to educate the public and our MPS that what we're looking at here is not religious freedom. It's not even religious discrimination. It's really just privileged. The bill is framed in terms and the arguments behind it, which supported is all framed in giving special.

Rights to people of religious belief. And this is very dangerous because it's so ill so hard to Define, and it's so open to abuse and it's so completely unnecessary. So, I think what members of our community should be saying rightly is we do support a religious

freedom Bill, we do believe, and I certainly do believe that people should not be discriminated on the basis of their religion. In the same way that we ought not discriminate against people on the basis of their sex or gender or their sexuality or their

Ability or their age, or their race, or whatever. That's fundamental. And of course, we can define those things. Very clearly and very specifically so that they work in a sensible way, but that's not what's happening here. So instead of this bill Being Framed as a shield, so that religious people can be protected from discrimination. It's been forged as a sword. So that religious people can wield that sword and and actively engage in discrimination in the name of their religion, or their

Belief, and that's what's so wrong. And that's what's so dangerous. And I think, once people understand that, then they start to support where you're coming from and the arguments you're trying to present. I think the other key thing that I would encourage members of our community to do is to expose the the rhetoric that euphemistic rhetoric. That is so often used by the religious conservatives in relation to this bill. And I'm talking here about schools and faith-based organization because the argument you

We'll hear repeatedly from Martin Kyle's from the ACL and others is that faith-based organizations simply want the ability to hire people in accordance with their faith. That's a euphemism that's code for not employ lgbt people expel gay kids, sat gay teachers, they won't come out and say that directly and specifically. So they captured in this camouflage terms of. We just want to hire people who support our

That work within our faith. But of course, what they mean is our faith is anti-lgbt. I so that's what we need to expose and we need to really put the blowtorch to the belly on people like that when they're being questioned and interviewed today in my view. They haven't been. So whenever they say this to a journalist in the mainstream press or we just want to hire people in accordance with their face. The very next question from the journalist must be. Does that mean that anybody or any?

Ation, who says that same-sex relationships or same-sex attraction is against their faith, can then be discriminated against and then watch them squirm? And of course, the other thing too, is that many of them will say, oh no, we we don't discriminate against lgbt people and we wouldn't but, you know, we just do this to protect our faith in which

case the very next question should be. Well, would you have any objections whatsoever to a

Amendment to this legislation which codified that which said that you can act in accordance with your faith when hiring. But that that Clause cannot be used as an excuse to discriminate against LGBTI employees. Again, watch them squirm because at the end of the day, this is what this is, what all of this is about fair enough. I think we've got a pretty well covered there and Melina's come in with a message saying that I agree with you Brian, the culture wars is

Losing track mentions, that John Roskam left, the IPA and had a, in my opinion, had a bit of a dummy. Spit this week, or we're losing the culture War as well. Is where's the world's smallest? Violin would be my response to that. So definitely. Yeah, it is about just getting some true. Know, some truth. In fact, back into it any like any last thoughts and I'll let you get back to your early morning in Western Australia. So only the last thing I do.

Adams that on Wednesday this week. So I just a few days ago attorney general mukasey Akash in a public relations exercise announced that she had written to the Australian Law Reform Commission asking them to ensure that no LGBTI kids could be discriminated against in faith schools as a result of the religious freedom legislation, which she hopes to pass. It's quite extraordinary that she would do that. If you think about it, for a number of reasons, but the key ones are these, she doesn't need to ask the law reform.

Mission to do that. Her government can pass legislation to do that. Absolutely. In fact, in fact, Scott Morrison promise to do that three years ago. Well, hasn't lifted a finger to do it. Absolutely is Alastair. Lori said over the weekend 1137 days ago and Counting. Yes. Yes, but there's a deeper philosophical argument here from my perspective and that and that's this. No journalist yet has got on the phone to Makayla Cash and said attorney.

Why does the government believed that discriminating against LGBTI? Students is wrong. Why is it believe it should be prohibited. I'd like to hear it here. Answer to that because you might expect money. Anticipate how she watching might say and then the very next

follow-up question is okay, then if you believe that discriminating against LGBTI kids is wrong and should be prohibited. Why do you take the exact opposite approach to teachers? Why is it that a student?

Who happens to be transgender or lesbian or gay? Why is it that they would be protected by your government under law in a faith school from discrimination and harassment? But not the teacher. Where do you draw the line here? And how do you explain the difference? I'm really waiting for that question to be asked to be attorney and I'll hand that over to you. Well, look, I'm not really sure McHale. He's going to come on three. So yeah, I have it. Well one my him.

Maybe one day. But look, it is a, these are fair questions. We've just got to ask these tough direct questions and get me a pin people down. As you say, if they have to squirm, they have to squirm but there be a publicly accountable officials. So let's do that and make it happen. Brian. Just lastly. How do people get in touch with just equal who, you're speaking for today. What are all the modern means of communication? In case they want more info from you?

Please just start with the website. So just just I've studied you forgotten the website. If you just Google just equal or just equal Australia. You'll find us, you'll find a great landing page with some information. There's a page there in particular, which points to all the people who do the wrong tree committee work for us and how to contact us. And also some illustrations. There of the campaigns. We're currently working on, including a PDF of a brochure will be produced. And

Sento, Federal MPS, expressing our concerns about this. Bill that brochure now, is some of it is outdated because it changes to the bill, but the general themes and arguments in there for everyone to see and we are at eight and the website is at equal dot. Org dot a you, but it also can Facebook as well, Brian. Thanks for your time. Well, this morning your time. This afternoon over here. Everyone. Stay tuned. We'll keep everyone up to date on all this. Thanks for your time. Let's go.

Keep up the work and let's make sure we get a just equal outcome. Thanks again. Thanks. So.

I'm Brian Craig from just equal on 3cr 855 am 3cr digital, 3C H, dot org dot, are you and 3cr On Demand? Let's have a little bit of a classic here, but reworked and covered pick this album up during the week. Colin Hay, doing an album of covers. Here's a track made famous, by that famous on Rainbow icon, Dusty Springfield, and I just don't know what to do with myself 3cr 855 am 3cr Digital 3, co.org, .u & 3, CR and demand out of the pan with

Sally.

I just don't know what to do with myself. Don't know just what to do with myself. I'm so used to do with you.

And for to another with you, I just don't know what to do. I'm So Lonesome.

I just don't know what to do, like a song.

I just don't know what, I don't know. Just what to do.

Like a summer.

Well, there's the he sang for some money, guarantee me a doll shopping channel. They said I got a hand along a new find the way, my hair grow.

Just wears a millionaire and he's winning teacher Secrets, poor, little dog. All the hate hundred number below.

The better, my life. Maybe then I could change your mind about me. Well, for all the free 99, there's a psychic hotline. I can call them like to hear what the future holds and for a small fee to could chip. And me some sort of laser machine that I'm a take my muscles grow. There's a man in the kitchen. Joy had a fried chicken. I can make it bigger. They can, all I gotta do is buy this video.

Number below.

Of my screen, I can get a brand new operators handed to better my life.



You're listening to three, see our community. Radio 855 am visit the three, see our website at three.co.org today. You forward slash podcast to the most recent recording for me to show or 3cr dot org dot. Are you forward slash streaming to listen life?

3cr give space to voices excluded from mainstream media to people who want to be heard and to help keep 3cr on the air. You need to donate And subscribe. Call 94, 1983, 77 or online at 3cr dot-org.

Otherwise happens, 3cr 855 am-3, see our digital three.co.org w3c are in demand out of the pan with Sally first broadcasting new through one Australian eastern daylight savings time, or well as we heard 9:51 Australian Western Standard Time. Thanks. Once again to Brian for coming on the show to talk about the well, we have to say the possibilities included in the up and a likely upcoming religious discrimination.

Without prejudice CEO, of course, might say that Matty, I, of course, couldn't possibly comment or something like that. Seriously, not good. Just reprising the music on the farm, the show so far today. We opened up with Paul Kelly and God told me to from the stolen apples album of some years ago. Now, possibly about 8 or 10 and its price. After that. We had a track from Colin Hay, doing the old Burt Bacharach number from an album of

Covers that he's just put out called. I just don't know what to do with myself. Of course, the song made famous by bike on Dusty Springfield, which is really awesome. And we also had a track that came my way. Call brand new personality by Bob Stetson. Now, that's a good name, for a singer of music that could be called, both binary kinds country and western. And of course, there is the non-binary type of Bluegrass as well. And I really liked

One little bit of fun and a little bit of a dig at personality. Now, sort of celebrity type of culture in a way and commercialism heaven knows what else. And this one talks about Bob being someone who is a zany ride for the average, Cowboy bloke, whose beer, and popcorn, doesn't impress, his girlfriend as it says here from on a release that I got his teacher teams and catch is inspired by it.

Info commercials to get a new personality. So, there it is. And he's a Nashville, traditional country artist. Originally from Quebec Canada balls you to you in my best bilingual approach influences, Buck Owens, Merle Haggard. Now, running out of time on the show today, but didn't want to cover a very important issue and I will very, very much raise the content warning here. So the content warning is for violence and I will say against a trans person. So if

Whew, if that is of concern to please activate your self defense mechanisms, once again, rainbow door, 1-800. Oh, 77293 67 switchboard. And as part of Q life around Australia, 1-800 1845 27, first and foremost, best wishes to kill and medic for a quick physical recovery, which seems to be underway, but also the quickest possible, mental and emotional recovery. And

And also to the medic family because during the week killing medic was assaulted in Smith Street Fitzroy. Not far, probably from in fact not very far at all from where I am broadcasting. Now. I'm literally M may be within 500 Max and a very difficult situation. There's a lot of complexities to it, which own wish we had more time on the show today. And the thing is first of all a salt and assaulting all salting and

Threatening assaulted, just not on, no matter how determined your views are. I don't see that as an answer for anyone of any Viewpoint political politically or ideologically and it is strongly of the belief that Killin was being threatened for their political views and listen to an interview with Andy medic on ref Epstein during the was on during the week and

And he says that, that is the belief and it also ties in with, with our research released by The Victorian Pride Lobby about people lgbti people's attitudes to police of which there's been well, so much intense debate online. Some people saying they weren't aware of the research and had they been? They would have perhaps given answers that are different to the majority. This research found 80% of the lgbti people surveyed, don't trust police. Some people are saying it was

Repeated widely and people could have done. Some people are not, but Andy has said that the attitudes that killins approach when speaking to police was asked where my word, a weariness of police, which I would be the first to say, I'm not 100% relaxed and

trusting with police type spoken about that publicly for many and many reasons. Not so much trans or little bit. But the general,

Aggressive attitude that a lot of police seem to have my words can't seem to distinguish between an innocent citizen. A motorist doing 66 in a 60 Zone and violent criminal and they are different situations yet. It seems they seem to take a lot of police at times and element. I don't care how big or small seem to have this, Everyone's an Ax Murderer approach and that's not the answer, then has to be some degree of Common Sense and discretion. Some, please do a good job. Let's be fair. But when you have such

A large percentage of a group and I a I need to get along as mentioned last week. Having some battles at the moment. Want to read this research in detail would be interesting to see how it broke down amongst a gay lesbian trans by and or parts of the rainbow because my guess based on previous Research into this trans, people are having more challenges with police than say, cisgender gays and lesbians. That's not to deny anyone's feelings. It's there. So this is a complex issue. There is an argument to say that as much

As you might disagree with some of the anti-vaccine intimate around and to tear down a poster, wasn't the right idea. I would be the first if it was an outright hate speech, opposed to saying something transphobic or racist, or whatever, tear it down. But I know you could have argued. With hindsight would have been better for two people to be together doing these things tearing down, those sorts of posters. If you want to do that, I don't think this is, you know, as nuanced as people are making out the last issue, which I want to come back to it again.

Is a relatively, I'll call this a medium content, warning, Tim Payne. Now. I'm a little mystified by this. If someone consensually sends a photo of whatever to someone else. Why is that a problem? Is it that we expect high standards of an Australian test Captain? I don't know what the issue is there that I'm, you know, obviously don't want sexual harassment and I've experienced it myself. I just don't think I'm still a little unclear about this one.

You know, and I think that if anything is safe consensual and of appropriate age, and then I think we need to have a more nuanced approach to speak to a lot of issues and

that's something that I'd like to come back to in a future show on many issues. We seem to be losing Nuance. So very quickly just a couple of references out of today's show just equal cited equal dot org and follow Alasdair Lori's blog at Alasdair Lori Al Asta IRL a wrie dotnet and

The latest piece put up on today is LGBT kids. Don't need more Hollow promises. And that's where Alasdair quotes that we're at 1137 days and counting. I better move out of here. Make Way for freedom of species. Lots of good animal. Advocacy, vegan vegetarian ideas coming up next. Thanks. Once again to Brian Greg, take you out today with the track that I rediscovered, as I'm getting back into the big vinyl CDs. And

Thought I'd like to play from 1982's music from the monkey grip, album his, the late great, Christina and flirt, and Christian, put up front with Mark McKintee and a track called Elsie. Thanks for tuning in to out of the pan on Sally Goldner. Catch you next week.